	Case 2:05-cv-00948-RSL Docume	ent 23	Filed 06/14/06	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6 7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE				
8	ROBERTO ORTIZ,				
9	Plaintiff,				
10	v.	С	ase No. C05-09	48L	
11	HOMELAND SECURITY,		RDER RENOTI IOTION FOR R		
12	Defendant.				
13					
14					
15	This matter comes before the Court <i>sua sponte</i> . Plaintiff has filed a "Motion for				
10	Release from Homeland Security and Compensation for Violation of Civil and Human				
17	Rights" (Dkt. #19) (the "Motion for Release") which the Court has construed as a				
18	dispositive motion. The motion is noted for consideration on June 30, 2006. However,				
19	on June 12, 2006, the Court granted defendant's motion for a more definite statement and				
20	ordered plaintiff to file, within thirty days, an amended complaint that complies with the				
21	pleading requirements of Rule 8(e)(1). In support of its motion for a more definite				
22	statement, defendant stated that plaintiff's complaint contained insufficient factual				
23	information to allow defendant to answer. Defendant should not be required to respond				
24	to plaintiff's dispositive motion before plaintiff files a complaint that complies with the				
25	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is directed to				
26	ORDER RENOTING MOTION - 1				
	•				

1	RENOTE plaintiff's Motion for Release for consideration on August 4, 2006.		
2			
3	DATED this 14th day of June, 2006.		
4			
5	Mar S Cara V		
6	MMS (asnik) Robert S. Lasnik		
7	United States District Judge		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	ORDER RENOTING MOTION - 2		